

## Inpatient/intensive outpatient drug treatment (incarceration)

Benefit-cost estimates updated December 2014. Literature review updated November 2014.

Current estimates replace old estimates. Numbers will change over time as a result of model inputs and monetization methods.

The WSIPP benefit-cost analysis examines, on an apples-to-apples basis, the monetary value of programs or policies to determine whether the benefits from the program exceed its costs. WSIPP's research approach to identifying evidence-based programs and policies has three main steps. First, we determine "what works" (and what does not work) to improve outcomes using a statistical technique called meta-analysis. Second, we calculate whether the benefits of a program exceed its costs. Third, we estimate the risk of investing in a program by testing the sensitivity of our results. For more detail on our methods, see our [technical documentation](#).

Program Description: This grouping of programs includes inpatient or intensive outpatient treatment delivered during incarceration.

### Benefit-Cost Summary

Program benefits		Summary statistics	
Participants	\$0	Benefit to cost ratio	\$10.45
Taxpayers	\$4,390	Benefits minus costs	\$14,861
Other (1)	\$10,642	Probability of a positive net present value	100 %
Other (2)	\$1,403		
Total	\$16,436		
Costs	(\$1,575)		
Benefits minus cost	\$14,861		

The estimates shown are present value, life cycle benefits and costs. All dollars are expressed in the base year chosen for this analysis (2013). The economic discount rates and other relevant parameters are described in our [technical documentation](#).

### Detailed Monetary Benefit Estimates

Source of benefits	Benefits to				Total benefits
	Participants	Taxpayers	Other (1)	Other (2)	
From primary participant					
Crime	\$0	\$4,390	\$10,642	\$2,190	\$17,223
Adjustment for deadweight cost of program	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$787)	(\$787)
Totals	\$0	\$4,390	\$10,642	\$1,403	\$16,436


We created the two "other" categories to report results that do not fit neatly in the "participant" or "taxpayer" perspectives. In the "Other (1)" category we include the benefits of reductions in crime victimization and the economic spillover benefits of improvement in human capital outcomes. In the "Other (2)" category we include estimates of the net changes in the value of a statistical life and net changes in the deadweight costs of taxation.

## Detailed Cost Estimates

	Annual cost	Program duration	Year dollars	Summary statistics	
Program costs	\$1,594	1	2014	Present value of net program costs (in 2013 dollars)	(\$1,575)
Comparison costs	\$0	1	2014	Uncertainty (+ or - %)	10 %

Estimate provided by the Washington State Department of Corrections.

The figures shown are estimates of the costs to implement programs in Washington. The comparison group costs reflect either no treatment or treatment as usual, depending on how effect sizes were calculated in the meta analysis. The uncertainty range is used in Monte Carlo risk analysis, described in our [technical documentation](#).



## Meta-Analysis of Program Effects

Outcomes measured	Primary or secondary participant	No. of effect sizes	Treatment N	Unadjusted effect size (random effects model)		Adjusted effect sizes and standard errors used in the benefit-cost analysis					
						First time ES is estimated			Second time ES is estimated		
				ES	p-value	ES	SE	Age	ES	SE	Age
Crime	Primary	7	1553	-0.176	0.001	-0.176	0.046	35	-0.176	0.046	45

## Citations Used in the Meta-Analysis

- Baer, J. S., Kivlahan, D. R., Blume, A. W., McKnight, P., & Marlatt, G. A. (2001). Brief intervention for heavy-drinking college students: 4-year follow-up and natural history. *American Journal of Public Health, 91*(8), 1310-1316.
- Daley M., Love C.T., Shepard D.S., Petersen C.B., White K.L., & Hall F.B. (2004). Cost-effectiveness of Connecticut's in-prison substance abuse treatment. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 39*(3), 69-92.
- Borsari, B., & Carey, K. B. (2000). Effects of a brief motivational intervention with college student drinkers. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68*(4), 728-733.
- Drake, E. K. (2006). *Washington's drug offender sentencing alternative: An update on recidivism findings* (Document No. 06-12-1901). Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- Juarez, P., Walters, S. T., Daugherty, M., & Radi, C. (2006). A randomized trial of motivational interviewing and feedback with heavy drinking college students. *Journal of Drug Education, 36*(3), 233-246.
- Duwe, G. (2010). Prison-based chemical dependency treatment in Minnesota: An outcome evaluation. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 6*(1), 57-81.
- Larimer, M. E., Turner, A. P., Anderson, B. K., Fader, J. S., Kilmer, J. R., Palmer, R. S., & Counce, J. M. (2001). Evaluating a brief alcohol intervention with fraternities. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 62*(3), 370-380.

- Peters, R. H., Kearns, W. D., Murrin, M. R., Dolente, A. S., & May, R. L. (1993). Examining the effectiveness of in-jail substance abuse treatment. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 19(3/4), 1-39.
- Murphy, J. G., Duchnick, J. J., Vuchinich, R. E., Davison, J. W., Karg, R. S., Olson, A. M., . . . Coffey, T. T. (2001). Relative efficacy of a brief motivational intervention for college student drinkers. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 15(4), 373-379.
- Porter, R. (2002). *Breaking the cycle: Technical report*. New York: Vera Institute of Justice.
- Schaus, J. F., Sole, M. L., McCoy, T. P., Mullett, N., & O'Brien, M. C. (2009). Alcohol screening and brief intervention in a college student health center: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, Suppl. 16*, 131-141.

For further information, contact:  
(360) 586-2677, [Institute@wsipp.wa.gov](mailto:Institute@wsipp.wa.gov)

Printed on 03-10-2015



## Washington State Institute for Public Policy

The Washington State Legislature created the Washington State Institute for Public Policy in 1983. A Board of Directors—representing the legislature, the governor, and public universities—governs WSIPP and guides the development of all activities. WSIPP's mission is to carry out practical research, at legislative direction, on issues of importance to Washington State.